

REMARKS

In the aforementioned office communication, claims 5, 7, 30, 32, 41 and 42 were indicated as being allowed with claims 2, 3, 9-12, 16-28, 33-36 and 38-40 being rejected. Claims 6 and 31 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 6 and 31 have been canceled herein and rewritten as new claims 43 and 44 respectively which are the independent expressions of canceled claims 6 and 31 so that they are felt to be in allowable form.

Each of the rejected claims is rejected based on the disclosure in Buck et al. and various combinations with Fraczek, Fun and Judkins. In as much as the Buck et al. reference is common to the rejection of all of the claims that have been rejected in the application, it is felt that the removal of that reference as a valid basis for the rejection would render each of these claims allowable.

In applicant's prior amendment to the application, it was pointed out it is applicant's feeling the Buck et al. reference is non-analogous art to the present invention. The Examiner did not concur and has stated he feels the Buck et al. reference is analogous because (1) it is in the same field of endeavor as Fraczek and Fun, which is the art of spools which have cord that winds there around and slides down the spool and (2) even if Buck et al. is not considered to be in the same field of endeavor, it is clearly concerned with the same objective as applicant, increasing friction between the spool and cord to tighten the windings. Applicant does not concur with the Examiner's conclusions regarding relevancy for reasons set forth hereafter.

First of all, it is applicant's feeling the field of endeavor of the present invention and that of Buck et al. is not the same. The field of endeavor for yarn feeders as disclosed in the Buck et al. reference is focused on continuously feeding yarn to a textile

machine, preferably knitting machines, in which the yarn feeder spools ensure positive feed of the yarn without overlap. In order to continuously feed a yarn to a machine by way of the yarn feeder spool, it is essential for such a spool to have distinct and separate ends where the yarn is fed onto the spool at one end and pulled off the spool at the other end. Also, the yarn loops formed on these spools are of a transient nature, i.e. they are not meant to stay on the spool but are passing across the spool to the textile machinery. The endeavor of feeding transient loops of yarn in a continuously dynamic situation is very different from the more batch like operation of winding and unwinding cord on a spool. Accordingly, it is not felt the arts are analogous.

With regard to the Examiner's second reason for the Buck et al. reference being analogous to the present invention, it is stated that both inventions have the same objective; that is increasing friction between the spool and the cord to tighten the windings. Not only does applicant disagree with this conclusion, but it is felt the Buck et al. reference even teaches away from the present invention in that the present invention utilizes the ribs to control circumferential friction of the cord with the spool while permitting axial displacement of the cords along the length of the spool. In the Buck et al. reference, such a result would be deleterious to the transient nature of the loops on the feeders spool as it would tighten the loops about the spool when it is desired that they actually remain relaxed or more loose. The Buck et al. spool has been designed as shown in Fig. 2 to create relaxation in the yarns to facilitate axial displacement. See for example, Col. 3, Lines 10-16 and Lines 42-45. Ribs on the spool for the purpose of controlling friction, as in the present invention, would be detrimental to the loosening effect of Buck et al. and such an objective would therefore be an unlikely purpose of the

ribs provided on the Buck et al. yarn feeder spool. Even if one assumes a person skilled in the art of window coverings would be aware of the Buck et al. reference, which is seriously doubted, this person in his search for obtaining more frictional engagement between the cord and the spool for a window blind would likely not find his answer in the Buck et al. reference as the ribs in this reference apparently encourage looseness as desired for the transport of yarn for the spool. While the present invention and the Buck et al. reference disclose the use of conical surfaces for facilitating or encouraging axial movement of a cord or yarn, one would not look to the Buck et al. reference for the remaining benefits obtained in the present invention with the ribs, i.e. the control of the friction of the lift cord with the spool as Buck et al. teaches away from this concept and encouraging a relaxation of the yarn loops.

Further, with regard to the Examiner's second reason for concluding the analogy between Buck et al. and the present invention, it would appear the Examiner has used hindsight in assigning the same objective to Buck et al. as that of the present invention in that as mentioned above, there is nothing in the Buck et al. reference to suggest that the ribs are provided to control friction between a yarn loop and the spool. In reality, the Buck et al. reference only discloses two sentences related to the purpose of the ribs (which are optional anyway) and these are found in Col. 3, Line 63 where it states "... so that the yarn rests only on the rib-like portion of the surface located between the grooves or slots" and in Col. 7, Lines 1-10 where it is stated "... it is thereby obtained that the yarn rests only on rib-area's of the surface which may be suitable under some circumstances for the purpose of yarn feeding". Accordingly, it is not at all apparent and in fact it would suggest otherwise that the purpose of the ribs in the Buck et al. spool are

for controlling friction between the yarns and the spool as the yarns must remain in a relaxed state to be transported across the spool to a textile machine. On the contrary, in the present invention, applicant utilizes the ribs to control the friction between a cord and the spool in countering the tendency for the cords to loosen on the spool as the diameter of the spool is reduced.

For the aforementioned reasons, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would reconsider the rejection of claims 2, 3, 9-12, 16-28, 33-36 and 38-40 as the art relied upon in rejecting these claims and principally the Buck et al. reference does not appear to be related to the present invention nor are the inventions developed for obtaining the same results as in fact they would appear to obtain a different and possibly even opposite result.

Should the Examiner not agree with the above, it would be appreciated if he would enter this Amendment for purposes of appeal as it would reduce the issues for appeal in that claims 6 and 31 have been canceled herein and replaced with new claims 43 and 44 which it is presumed are allowable.

Dated this 1st day of August, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorsey & Whitney LLP



Gary M. Plumbus, Reg. No. 25,364
USPTO Customer No. 20686
Tel: (303) 628-1500
Fax: (303) 629-3450

GMP/pge/dtc